application.

If any independent claims are allowed, we request the removal of the restriction requirement for any claims that are dependent as originally filed from the allowed independent claims in this

The Traverse is on the grounds that the search and examination of the entire application, claims 1-27 can be made without any serious burden, the Examiner must examine on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct invention (see MPEP 803.) All of the claims are drawn to the launching device with varied methods of use, which does not pose a burden to search and examine. The core of the invention is the launching device. The Examiner has not stated why there is a serious burden in examining all of these claims.

Furthermore, there is no evidence that the method claims of groups II – III are patentable without the details of group I. The relationship between the claims is such that the separately claimed group I constitutes the essential distinguishing feature of the methods in groups II-IIII as claimed, therefore the inventions are not really distinct and a requirement for restriction should not be made. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the above restriction requirement.

## REMARKS

If the Examiner believes that there is any issue which could be resolved by a telephone or personal interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicants hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such an extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 04-1061.

Attorney Docket No. 28636.0002 Customer No.: 35161

Reg. No. 51,307

Respectfully submitted,

John M. Naber

Registration No. 46,487

DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC 1901 L Street NW, Suite 800 Washington DC 20036-3506 Telephone: 734-623-1931

Facsimile: 202-659-1559 Date: April 21, 2005

DC 28636-1 101709v1